



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/868,379	08/15/2001	Christian Kropf	H 3763 PCT/U	8884
423	7590	03/22/2004	EXAMINER	
HENKEL CORPORATION THE TRIAD, SUITE 200 2200 RENAISSANCE BLVD. GULPH MILLS, PA 19406			JAGOE, DONNA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/868,379

Applicant(s)

KROPF ET AL.

Examiner

Donna Jagoe

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/15/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claims 8-14 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "nonionic surfactant" in lines 3-4 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because claim 9, from which claim 10 depends does not recite a nonionic surfactant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudin et al. WO 98/18719 (AJ) in view of Burghard U.S. Patent No. 5,935,275 (AA) and Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences (1975).

The claims are drawn to a suspension of one or more phosphate, fluoride or fluorophosphates calcium salts in a liquid medium in which the salts are less than 1g/L soluble, wherein the calcium salts comprise primary particles having diameters of from 5 to 50 nanometers (nm) and lengths of from 10 to 150 nm which have been stabilized

against agglomeration by a water soluble surfactant or a water soluble polymeric protective colloid adsorbed onto said particles.

Rudin et al. teach the well-known method of producing hydroxyapatite (HAP) comprising mixing a calcium salt (calcium hydroxide) with an aqueous solution of phosphoric acid and grinding the reaction product (page 1). The HAP particles are from 0.01 to 0.02 μm in width (10-20 nm) and 0.5 to 0.1 μm (500-100 nm) in length and a *homogeneous* concentration within the range of from 7% to 96% in the form of a suspension or a paste (page 3 paragraphs 2-5).

It does not teach the addition of a surfactant or a polymeric protective colloid to prevent agglomeration. Burgard teaches methods of stabilizing insoluble inorganic nanoparticles against agglomeration, including by precipitation in the presence of surface active compounds. Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences provides further motivation to employ a surfactant, specifically a nonionic surfactant to prevent agglomeration of particles. Remington teaches three major uses for surfactants, wetting, solubilization and emulsifying agents (page 297, 1st paragraph). Wetting aids in the dispersion of powders to prepare pharmaceutical suspensions by breaking apart the strong bonding between granules, air between the granules and a hydrophobic surface that would prevent a solvent from penetrating and wetting (page 297).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 8-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of copending Application No. 10/297889. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant and conflicting claims recite substantially the same subject matter, differing only in the description of the particular components claimed. For instance, conflicting claim 1 requires the particular polyelectrolyte, in combination with a calcium salt of low solubility in water such as calcium phosphate generally. None of the instant claims recites that specific combination, but instant claims 1-2 are broadly inclusive thereof since the polyelectrolyte is inclusive of polymeric protective colloids. It would have been obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in the art that the claims overlapped in scope in this manner. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to have interpreted the claims as broadly as is reasonable, and in doing so recognize that they are coextensive in scope

Art Unit: 1614

and thus the proper subject of an obviousness-type double patenting rejection as outlined by *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970). The selection of particular process of making and methods of use are coextensive in scope. It would have been obvious to smooth the surface of teeth with the composition since it is well known to remineralize teeth. By remineralizing teeth one would also be smoothing teeth.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Correspondence


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donna Jagoe whose telephone number is (571) 272-0576. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel can be reached on (571) 272-0584. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Application/Control Number: 09/868,379
Art Unit: 1614

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Donna Jagoe
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1614



MARIANNE C. SEIDEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600